

# THE BROADCASTERS' CREED

We Believe:

- 1 That American Broadcasting is a living creed
- 2 of democracy; a steadfast and necessary instru-
- 3 ment for maintaining freedom of expression, as
- 4 established in the First Amendment to the Consti-
- 5 tution of the United States.
- 6 That its influence in the arts, in science, in edu-
- 7 cation, in public affairs, and in the public welfare,
- 8 generally, is such as to make it the only profes-
- 9 sion in which the responsibility is to the common good
- 10 of the whole people.
- 11 That it is our obligation to serve the people in
- 12 such a way as to reflect credit upon our free-
- 13 dom and to encourage aspiration toward a bet-
- 14 ter state for all mankind; by making available
- 15 to the people the best of the human mind, and by
- 16 presenting the traditional standards of the United
- 17 States in all phases of the broadcasting art.
- 18 That we should make full and complete use of
- 19 the power of knowledge, of science and the arts,
- 20 and exercise critical and discriminating judg-
- 21 ment in all broadcasting operations to the end that
- 22 we may intelligently and constructively:
- 23 • observe the proprieties and customs of civilized
- 24 society;
- 25 • observe the rights and sensitivities of all people;
- 26 • respect the sanctity of marriage and the home;
- 27 • honor the spirit and dignity and brotherhood
- 28 of all mankind;
- 29 • furnish the daily life of the people through the
- 30 factual reporting and analysis of the news, and
- 31 through programs of education, entertainment and
- 32 information;
- 33 • provide for the fair discussion of matters of
- 34 general public concern; regard to words directed
- 35 toward the common good; and volunteer our aid
- 36 and effort in times of crisis and emergency;
- 37 • consider the demands of truth; by encouraging
- 38 the development and conservation of natural re-
- 39 sources; and by bringing together the better and
- 40 the good.

R.B. Hull - wa

148

11 - after through the broadcasting of information per  
12 - taining to goods and services.  
13 - As a guide for the achievement of our purposes,  
14 - we subscribe to the following:

## STANDARDS OF PRACTICE - PROGRAM STANDARDS

- 1 News
- 2 News reporting should be factual, fair and with-
- 3 out bias. Commentary and analysis should be clearly
- 4 identified as such.
- 5 Good taste should prevail in the selection and
- 6 handling of news. Material sensational or otherwise
- 7 should not be included in the factual report, especially
- 8 in connection with stories of crime or sex, should
- 9 be avoided. News should be broadcast in such a
- 10 manner as to avoid panic and unnecessary alarm.
- 11 Broadcasters should exercise due care in their
- 12 selection of material, and should not permit the
- 13 selection of newscasters, commentators and
- 14 others to be so susceptible to outside influences as to
- 15 be in the acceptance of news, news commentary, and
- 16 in news programs and segments of adver-
- 17 tising in the same class. Advertising should
- 18 be presented, and program, such as its content
- 19 from the news content.
- 20 In programs of news, news commentary, and
- 21 news analysis - which are the most serious in
- 22 nature - no more than two commercial adver-
- 23 tisements should be used and they should be given at
- 24 the beginning and end of the program.
- 25 Agricultural and marine news, and news of the
- 26 government and marine news, should be given at
- 27 the beginning and end of the program.
- 28 In news programs, no more than two commercial
- 29 advertisements should be used and they should be given at
- 30 the beginning and end of the program.
- 31 In news programs, no more than two commercial
- 32 advertisements should be used and they should be given at
- 33 the beginning and end of the program.
- 34 In news programs, no more than two commercial
- 35 advertisements should be used and they should be given at
- 36 the beginning and end of the program.
- 37 In news programs, no more than two commercial
- 38 advertisements should be used and they should be given at
- 39 the beginning and end of the program.
- 40 In news programs, no more than two commercial
- 41 advertisements should be used and they should be given at
- 42 the beginning and end of the program.

# RADIO BROADCASTING— A PROFESSION

AN ADDRESS BY JUSTIN MILLER,  
PRESIDENT, THE NATIONAL  
ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS

## Political Broadcasts\*\*

- 1 Political broadcasts, or the dissemination
- 2 of political views designed to influence voters,
- 3 should be treated in a manner similar to that
- 4 of news.

## Public Affairs and Issues

- 1 A broadcaster in allocating time for the
- 2 discussion of public questions, including
- 3 issues of public importance, should not be
- 4 influenced by commercial considerations, but
- 5 should be guided by the public interest.
- 6 In the selection of material, and in the
- 7 handling of programs, broadcasters should
- 8 be guided by the public interest.
- 9 Discussion of controversial subjects
- 10 should be presented in a balanced and
- 11 impartial manner, and they should be
- 12 so presented as to make no attempt to
- 13 influence the opinion of the audience.
- 14 The presentation of controversial
- 15 subjects should be in a manner which is
- 16 fair and impartial, and the facts
- 17 should be presented in a balanced and
- 18 impartial manner, and they should be
- 19 so presented as to make no attempt to
- 20 influence the opinion of the audience.

## Religious Programs

- 1 Broadcasters, which
- 2 are religious, should
- 3 be presented in a
- 4 manner which is
- 5 fair and impartial,
- 6 and the facts
- 7 should be presented
- 8 in a balanced and
- 9 impartial manner,
- 10 and they should be
- 11 so presented as to
- 12 make no attempt to
- 13 influence the opinion
- 14 of the audience.

- 19 such considerations as the integrity
- 20 of the character of the product, the fa-
- 21 ther, the quality of the product, the fa-
- 22 ther, the quality of the product, the fa-
- 23 ther, the quality of the product, the fa-
- 24 ther, the quality of the product, the fa-
- 25 ther, the quality of the product, the fa-
- 26 ther, the quality of the product, the fa-
- 27 ther, the quality of the product, the fa-
- 28 ther, the quality of the product, the fa-
- 29 ther, the quality of the product, the fa-
- 30 ther, the quality of the product, the fa-
- 31 ther, the quality of the product, the fa-
- 32 ther, the quality of the product, the fa-
- 33 ther, the quality of the product, the fa-
- 34 ther, the quality of the product, the fa-
- 35 ther, the quality of the product, the fa-
- 36 ther, the quality of the product, the fa-
- 37 ther, the quality of the product, the fa-
- 38 ther, the quality of the product, the fa-
- 39 ther, the quality of the product, the fa-
- 40 ther, the quality of the product, the fa-

## Time Standards for Advertising Copy

- 1 As a guide to the determination of paid
- 2 advertising copy, the time standards for ad-
- 3 vertising copy are established as follows:
- 4 The maximum time to be used for advertising
- 5 copy, shall be:
- 6 program, shall be:

Between 6:00 P.M. and 11:00 P.M.	
1 3 minute programs	1.00
2 5 minute programs	1.50
3 10 minute programs	2.00
4 15 minute programs	2.50
5 20 minute programs	3.00
6 30 minute programs	4.00
7 45 minute programs	5.00
8 60 minute programs	6.00
All Other Hours	
9 3 minute programs	1.15
10 5 minute programs	1.75
11 10 minute programs	2.30
12 15 minute programs	2.90
13 20 minute programs	3.45
14 30 minute programs	4.65
15 45 minute programs	5.90
16 60 minute programs	7.00





# RADIO BROADCASTING— A PROFESSION

BY JUSTIN MILLER

PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS

*An address delivered before the Twenty-Sixth Annual Convention of the National Association of Broadcasters, at Los Angeles, California, on May 17, 1948.*

★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★

For some time, the broadcasters of America have been preoccupied with Standards of Practice. After several experimental years, the members of our Association—by an almost unanimous referendum vote—empowered the Board of Directors to adopt appropriate standards and take necessary steps to secure observance of them. Last September, the Board brought to the Convention a proposed draft of Standards; which were there analyzed and discussed, with no punches pulled. The Board then gave consideration to suggested changes; it adopted the Standards in principle, but invited additional suggestions and objections, and announced that all would be weighed carefully, before the Standards were put into effect. During the last six months, there has been widespread discussion of the proposals; many changes have been made; extensive restyling has taken place; many members and officers of the Association have participated in the process. Now, we will have opportunity, again, for full consideration at this Convention. There will be no more important subject presented for your consideration.

Let me emphasize, again, that in spite of your delegation of power, the Board has proceeded with great care and deliberation, and has no intention of doing otherwise in the future. This is not the kind of work



which should be done hastily. Robert Louis Stevenson's maxim<sup>1</sup> that "*Nothing should be done in a hurry which can be done slowly*" has been particularly pertinent.

There are those who have feared delay because they know that good salesmanship requires striking "*while the iron is hot*"; that a sale may be lost by timidity or shyness at the psychological moment; that it is necessary to go forward quickly to the desired culmination, as in the case of the famous Southern General who said that he won battles because he got there "*fastest with the mostest men*." The importance of speed techniques, as applied to salesmanship and to war, may readily be admitted, but it must be recognized and understood that what we are doing here is building upon foundations which have been laid by professional people who have gone before us; that we are laying new and additional foundations for those who will follow us. We will discover that standard setting is a long, continuing process, which begins slowly and moves slowly; shaping rules and regulations to the facts of life, as we live through various types of experience. We will discover, also, that people react in various ways to this process. Some have a natural instinct for affirmative action; some are carried along by the enthusiasm of others; some are inclined to drag reluctant feet; and a few, if we are not careful, may actually pour sand into the gears. We will be much more likely to secure cooperative acceptance by all, if all understand the objective which we seek to achieve and feel that they have a real part in it. Such a project, hastily done, and more or less forced upon some of those who are affected by it, invites criticism, invites opposition, and, sometimes, destroys itself as a result.

It is important that we recognize our undertaking as one of professional character; that in adopting standards of practice, we are assuming a professional status. What is it, after all, that distinguishes a profession from a trade or business? Clearly, there is much in common between them. In both we find skilled craftsmen; in both there are special vocabularies and special techniques. In both we find associations for advancing the individual proficiency of the members and the collective prosperity of the whole group. They are not to be distinguished on these grounds. Again, most professional groups are subject to governmental licensing. A lawyer, for example, must be formally examined and licensed to practice. If he violates the conditions of his license—express or implied—he may be disbarred. The same is true of physicians, dentists, teachers and others. In this respect, therefore, we find an identity between broadcasters and the established professions. But, many others who are *not* professionals must be licensed also; practically all trades, in some

---

<sup>1</sup> "The Morality of the Profession of Letters", *Fortnightly Review* April 1881, STEVENSON'S WORKS, Vol. 7, pp. 433, 441, P. F. Collier & Son Edition (1912).



states. So we must look beyond this point of identification.

Of course, the real question is, what are the *common characteristics of recognized professional groups which are different from those of non-professional groups*. Most people assume that lawyers, physicians and ministers are members of professions, just because tradition classifies them as such. However, during recent years, we have seen a wide expansion of the classification. A recent publication entitled "*Statutory Status of Six Professions*" lists Accountancy, Architecture, Law, Medicine, Nursing, Teaching. It is customary to think, also, of engineers, dentists, journalists, musicians, actors, and a number of others, as falling within the professional category. Certainly, it should be a challenge to broadcasters to inquire why these groups are any more entitled to professional prestige than they. In other words, what does an accountant, an engineer, a nurse, or a teacher have that a broadcaster does not?

It has been suggested by some that the distinction lies in the attitude of the professional man toward his work. One writer<sup>2</sup> expressed the idea in these terms: "*The difference between industry, as it exists today, and a profession is, then, simple and unmistakable. The essence of the former is that its only criterion is the financial return which it offers to its shareholders. The essence of the latter is that, though men enter it for the sake of a livelihood, the measure of their success is the service which they perform, not the gains which they amass. They may, as in the case of a successful doctor, grow rich; but the meaning of their profession, both for themselves and for the public, is not that they make money, but that they make health, or safety, or knowledge, or good law. They depend on it for their income, but they do not consider that any conduct which increases their income is on that account good.*" Perhaps this is unnecessarily rough on the businessman; perhaps it gives too much credit to the professions. Certainly, it fails to distinguish between individuals in both groups. But let us use the statement—by way of hypothesis—to describe the attitudes of the two groups, generally.

Now, what of the broadcaster? Does he consider that any conduct which increases his income is on that account good? Or, is he concerned with the happiness, the knowledge, the welfare of the people? The question answers itself. So far, no one has raised any objection to the statement in our proposed Standards, which reads: "That it is our obligation to serve the people in such manner as to reflect credit upon our profession and to encourage aspiration toward a better estate for all mankind; by making available to every person in America, such programs as will perpetuate the traditional leadership of the United States in all phases of the broadcasting art."

---

<sup>2</sup> R. H. Tawney, author of "The Acquisitive Society", quoted in the ANNALS OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF POLITICAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCE, May 1922.



But, I would carry the distinction between business and profession one step farther. Not only the attitude of the professional man himself is important, but the attitudes of all concerned. What does the physician's patient think of the relationship? What of the lawyer's client? And what do people, generally, think?

Let us assume that a person employs a physician, or a lawyer, or a minister; tells him the most intimate secrets of his life or business, and asks for professional service, based upon his knowledge of a highly specialized professional science. Suppose then, the professional man should broadcast the person's troubles at a cocktail party, or blackmail him, as the price of secrecy concerning his weaknesses; or sell his secrets to an adversary; or give him shabby, dishonest shyster service, or prescribe poison, instead of appropriate drugs; would the person have cause for complaint? Would the fact that the professional man might be able to hide his misconduct behind his professional mystery, beyond the reach of the law, excuse the misconduct?

Certainly, everyone, except the most depraved minority would join in condemning such a professional man. Ninety-nine per cent of professional group members would wince in shame at the public disrepute which such misconduct brings upon a profession, and would agree that their voluntarily imposed and voluntarily observed standards of practice should discountenance it.

The distinction is pointed up, sharply, in the legal maxim, long applied to the business world, *Caveat emptor*—Let the buyer beware. The theory of this maxim was that buyer and seller were equally matched; they stood at arms length and dealt with each other as experience and sharp wits required. No one would think of requiring strict standards of ethics to govern equally-matched participants in a horse trade. We have all smiled, indulgently, over the technique of David Harum in disposing of his balking horse to the "*deakin*." But, everyone would assume that a parent, in dealing with a child, or a guardian, with a ward, would be more than careful to avoid taking advantage of the ignorance or lack of experience of the one who relied so implicitly upon him. Business transactions generally savor of the horse trade; professional relations generally resemble the fiduciary relationship of parent and child. The professional person, indeed, is of the priesthood, familiar with the mystery of his calling, and charged with the duty of administering to the welfare of the uninitiated.

Now, let us turn, again, to the broadcasters. Do they stand at arms length with their listeners; are both evenly matched, equally able to protect themselves? Obviously not! Oh, of course, the listener can turn off the radio! So can the owner of a horse lock the barn door after the horse is stolen. What of the bits of obscenity, which a particular performer



customarily ingratiate into his program; what of the repulsive commercial which follows, without a break, a delightful interlude of music; what of the horrible agonies and excruciating torments; the blueprints of crime which some strivers after Hooperatings are willing to broadcast? Are the complaints of parents, teachers, police, juvenile authorities, all without merit? I have no desire to dwell on unpleasant subjects. You are just as anxious as anyone to remove all just cause for complaint. The question is, how best to do so.

The broadcaster stands in the same position, faces the same problems, and has available to him, the same remedies as other professional groups, including the promulgation and observance of standards. The broadcaster, like other professionals, has a specialized field of knowledge; he has special skills in programming to fit the needs of his community. He knows how to balance and reconcile the interests of many different groups of listeners, of advertisers, of networks, of public officials, of political, religious, fraternal and civic groups. Do you know any professional man who is required to have more widely diversified and specialized knowledge, and to use more specialized skills, in the many delicate adjustments of his professional activities to the people he serves? Do you know any professional man who is charged with more important discretionary powers under the law, or with a more important obligation to serve the public interest, the public convenience and the public necessity? Do not the attitudes of all concerned—broadcaster, listener, the public, the government—coincide in assuming a professional relationship which is in every respect as important as that of accountant, engineer, nurse, teacher, journalist, dentist, physician, lawyer? Can we escape the conclusion that broadcasters, like other newly developed professional groups which I have mentioned, are holding themselves out as qualified and willing to perform services which involve the trustful reliance of those for whom such services are performed? Whether we all realize it, or not, gentlemen, that is the situation.

Perhaps some broadcasters fear that—in saying we need self-regulation through standards of practice—we are admitting guilt or losing “face”. They need have no such fear. Every professional group, every business group has met the same problem. Those with most “face” and greatest prestige are the ones which have gone farthest and established the highest standards. Indeed, if we were deliberately seeking association with the most *disreputable* groups, we would go to the ones which have refused to admit the need for self-regulation. Moreover, the professional and business groups which insist upon the highest standards and enjoy the greatest prestige are the ones which go farthest, not only in observance, but in enforcement, as well.

Some have suggested that to adopt standards of practice is merely to impose penal laws upon ourselves, when we should be fighting against



adverse legislation. This argument completely misconceives the nature and purpose of such standards. Penal laws are made to coerce the vicious or inadequate, criminals, persons at the bottom of the moral and intellectual scale of society, who lack capacity to make and observe standards of conduct for themselves.

Standards of practice and canons of ethics, on the other hand, invite and stimulate cooperative effort; they are the crystallization of beliefs, the expression of ideals; they strengthen and inspire the activities of natural leaders; they set up a banner—as it were—around which honest, well-intentioned men can rally; which may be used to educate those who are less experienced and those of lesser faith, those who have not yet caught the spark of enthusiasm and of inspiration which puts the welfare of their families, their communities—the happiness of all the people—above the miserable aspirations of selfishness.

Penal laws chafe and irritate free, independent, intelligent people, because they suggest viciousness and inadequacy where it does not exist. Standards of practice, voluntarily adopted and observed, eliminate the demand for penal legislation, because intelligent people in other groups know that such standards—expressing the ideals and desires of fair-minded people—will accomplish more, in the long run, than oppressive laws which invite evasion and avoidance.

A writer<sup>3</sup> upon this subject has said, recently: "*It is idle to assume that the overwhelming majority, composed of persons who are not guilty of these things, refrain only from fear of punishment. No police-system could possibly be effective enough to keep any large minority in prison, if this large minority had a strong impulse to disregard the penal laws. We must suppose that the majority—the great majority—of citizens abstain from theft and swindling because they have lost any strong impulse to increase their property in this way. In most cases, we may assign the change to a social habit that is begun early in childhood by the pressure of established customs, rather than by specific precepts.*"

In other words, there are great values to be achieved from standards of practice, quite apart from legal sanctions, or methods of enforcement. The fact that we fail, sometimes—or even that others fail more frequently—in observance of them, does not make them valueless. Some of the greatest compulsions of life—and some of the greatest satisfactions—come from the striving for such ideals, in association with our fellows, in communities, churches, clubs and in other social and professional groups.

When men sit down to play a game of gin-rummy, they take perfectly for granted the rules of the game which govern the playing. Natu-

---

<sup>3</sup> MANNERS AND MORALS OF BUSINESS, Max Radin, p. 251.



rally, this cramps the style of the one who would play by his own rules. It was considered proper in frontier days to shoot the "card sharp" on discovery. Today, lesser means of discipline are used. But, there is no appeal to "law" for redress; neither do the players shrug their shoulders, futilely and say, "*What's the use; it can't be helped.*" What is the sanction in such a situation? In other words, what makes the rules of the game effective and self-enforcing?

There is no "law" which compels obedience to the rules, when college teams play football, but there are moral, ethical, traditional and customary compulsions and sanctions, nevertheless, which operate to secure ninety-nine percent compliance and to enforce the edicts of the umpire and referee in the other one percent. So it is with standards, as contrasted with penal laws.

All this reveals the essence of that subtle fusion of human characteristics which I call the professional spirit. John H. Sorrells, writing of the profession of journalism, expressed my idea in these words:<sup>4</sup> "*. . . the newspaper is more than a business or a trade or a profession; it's a way of life. \* \* \* what counts is a man's own concept of the obligations inherent in it. \* \* \* The law is a noble profession. So is medicine and the profession of arms. \* \* \* There are, of course, cowards and traitors among soldiers. There are quacks among the doctors, and shysters among lawyers. There are also newspaper 'merchants' with pawnbroker souls. But for every quack, there are a hundred sincere and honest doctors whose lives are dedicated in self-denial and compassion to healing the sick. For every shyster, there are a hundred earnest lawyers dedicated to the preservation of an orderly society and the securing of justice for the common man. And for every journalistic sharper, there are a hundred sincere newspapermen whose primary determination, whose fiercest instinct, is to serve, to improve the society in which they live.*"

Of course, there are limits to the possibilities which may be expected of standards. In the first place, there is an absolute limit beyond which standards cannot go—or penal laws either—without destroying the subject to which they are applied. If success cannot be achieved by any broadcaster except by practices which some critics urge should be condemned, then, obviously, the practices cannot be condemned. Nothing could be accomplished by pious protestations beyond all possibility of achievement, except to convince the people that those who proposed them were frauds and hypocrites. Obviously, they would not receive support from anyone, including their promulgators.

Even if some suggested standards would be entirely feasible for a large percentage of broadcasters, it may be unwise to impose them,

---

<sup>4</sup> EDITOR & PUBLISHER, April 10, 1948, Vol. 81, No. 16, p. 9.



nevertheless. Profitable, forbidden practices would be used by marginal operators—especially in times of business stress—to gain an unfair competitive advantage over those who did observe the standards. The result would be that others—who, normally, would comply with the standards—would be induced to follow suit. For example, Max Gardner, former Governor of North Carolina and a cotton mill operator, once told me that the need for child labor laws resulted from the refusal of fifteen percent of the mill owners to comply with the desire of the other eighty-five percent to eliminate child labor, voluntarily. It would be foolish to adopt, even highly desirable standards, if they were so strict as to leave no alternative but violation, in self-defense against unfair competition.

This consideration is particularly important, just now, because of the substantial number of marginal operators who are, or will be, so close to the line between black and red, as to make it difficult for them to survive on a high standard of performance. These people are entitled to our sympathy and consideration. Many of them were persuaded to apply for licenses by exaggerated estimates of broadcasters' profits, which were issued from government sources. In fact, estimates which were released—indicating that one could build and operate a station upon a \$10,000 or \$12,000 outlay—constituted a cruel misrepresentation which, if it had come from private rather than from governmental sources, might well have resulted in governmental prosecution. It is unreasonable to expect that these persons could voluntarily participate in a program of self-regulation and self-discipline which would destroy the possibility of their own successful operation. Indeed, if the normal curve of business failures occurs in broadcasting, a certain percentage of them will drop out anyway. Perhaps when that adjustment has taken place, the broadcasters may then decide to stiffen the standards, accordingly.

The difficulty in adopting adequate standards of practice is even more apparent because we are working so largely in an area of good taste, as contrasted with areas in which the law usually operates. What constitutes good taste and bad taste, varies decidedly with different people. In music, in literature, in entertainment, in controversial discussion, we must cover the whole wide range of possibilities—from the sublime to the ridiculous—if we are to satisfy the normal appetites of our people. Who shall say which is better or worse?

Even our staid and typically British critic, the BBC, gets into amusing difficulties from time to time. One of the *New York Times* London correspondents<sup>5</sup> described such an incident, concerning the broadcast of a Spanish bullfight. It was given as part of a program which lasted for an hour and a half, describing Easter festivities, both religious and general, in Denmark, Greece, Austria, Spain, and Italy. Soon after

---

<sup>5</sup> L. Marsland Gander, THE LONDON LETTER, *New York Times*, August 17, 1947, p. X-7.



the broadcast, the "humanitarians" sued for an injunction to restrain BBC from broadcasting the program again. The court dismissed the motion for an injunction and BBC re-broadcast the whole program, "this time on the sacred and serious Third program wave lengths." Then, miracle of miracles, George Bernard Shaw, in a letter to the *Daily Telegraph*, called for an inquiry into the mental condition of BBC. As the correspondent commented, "*Mr. Shaw's own works, have, for his own purposes, dealt with a number of most unpleasant and barbaric subjects, not excluding the burning at the stake of Joan of Arc.*" Just how inconsistent, even ludicrous, people may become when they attempt to become censors of people's tastes is well illustrated by this performance. We are fortunate that we have no BBC in control of broadcasting here. We hope we will have no government censor of the tastes of our people; and we should pray for guidance in our own efforts to set standards in this difficult area.

Again, with respect to this matter of taste, our standards should be drawn with sufficient flexibility, not only to *permit*, but to *encourage*, experimentation. Our achievements have come, largely, from willingness to permit adventures into unconventional areas. Frequently, the experimenter gets his fingers burned or his ears slapped down, but, occasionally, he turns up with a new and valuable technique. Our critics, who most volubly cry for such new and better techniques, are, of course, the first to complain bitterly of experiments which do not succeed. How far would a laboratory scientist get if he had to put up with a chorus of strident complainers and jeremiahs, who would break forth in lamentations and execrations whenever an experiment went wrong?

In expressing these necessary limitations, I have no intention of suggesting the adoption of ineffective or weaseling standards of practice. After giving full consideration to all phases of the problem, we must speak with such assurance and certainty that all can understand. Moreover, I have no intention of giving comfort to those small groups of individualists who do not believe in team play under any circumstances. They are like the prima donnas who want to carry the ball on every play; or, conversely, those who would abolish sports altogether. One of these is the smugly complacent and self-satisfied man who rejects every suggestion that he—or any other broadcaster—could possibly do wrong; he pours cold water on every plan for improvement; he seeks, constantly, to undercut and back-track; he waxes eloquent and at great length, in reciting the many virtues of his fellows, and the accomplishments of the great men of the past. Closely related to him—although he would scorn the association—is that other canny individualist who prefers to skim the cream of meretricious profits, so long as possible; risking public disfavor; inviting more and more restrictive regulation and legislation; building up trouble and harassment for all broadcasters in the years to come.



These men are unable to understand that the alternative to self-regulation is government regulation and, perhaps, government broadcasting itself; this, in spite of practically worldwide government operation, or close regulation of broadcasting everywhere except in the United States. Apparently, these men have been unaware of repeated legislative proposals for greater government control of broadcasting in this country; of *Mayflower* doctrines, of *Port Huron* cases; of Blue Book extravaganzas; of impossible programming promises of applicants, stimulated by these legislative and administrative forays.

If you need assurance on the subject, I can tell you that there are still plenty of possibilities for legislative limitations of broadcasting on both Federal and state levels; short of the grosser encroachments which I have been fighting, since I became your President. And, there are legislative and administrative devices for by-passing the Constitutional guarantees upon which I have been relying.

The Food and Drug Act, the Sherman Anti-trust law, the Federal Trade Commission Act, and the whole congeries of regulatory agencies and legislation which have come swarming after them, are good examples of what happens to people who are unwilling or unable to regulate their own conduct. Most recently, we have seen a wrathful people pull down the insolent and racketeering labor czars, with such legislation as the Lea Act and the Taft-Hartley Act. This, then, is our choice: To demonstrate, convincingly, that we are able and willing to do, as other professional groups have done before us, all that we can "to clean our own house", or to suffer the type of coercive controls which are visited upon the inadequate and the recalcitrant. Quibbling and sophistry will get us nowhere. We either keep our eye on the ball, or we lose control of the play. There is no more convincing way to do this than by the adoption, acceptance and observance of standards of practice, which appeal to all concerned, as a fair harmonizing of the ideal, on the one hand, and the realistic, down-to-earth necessities of practical, successful broadcasting, on the other.

Already we have seen evidences of changing attitudes upon the part of our erstwhile critics. Our relationships with the FCC and other government contacts are much healthier and there is far greater understanding by them, of broadcasters and their problems. While caustic newspaper comment and slanted magazine articles still appear, occasionally, generally speaking our work on the Standards has been accepted in good faith by the rival media, and favorable comment is well mixed with the unfavorable. We still hear of pressures exerted by advertisers for third-grade scripts, but we are getting wholehearted commendation and assurance that we are moving in the right direction, from responsible leaders among the advertisers and agencies.



Of course, this does not mean that the advertisers and agencies will be happy with every conclusion upon which *we* may agree. It is, of course, desirable that so far as possible, we secure understanding in advance and adherence in principle, rather than that there be conflict between these several groups. To secure such understanding and adherence with respect to the standards, we have been maintaining working relations with the ANA and AAAA. To this end, several meetings have been held with representatives of these groups, at which discussions have taken place concerning both the underlying principles and specific suggestions as to particular standards. I am happy to report that we have found a cordial willingness upon the part of these representatives and an apparent readiness to harmonize their views with those of the broadcasters, to the best interests of all.

During the work of preparation, the question of enforcement of the Standards has come constantly to the fore. We cannot keep this out of the minds of those who are to be affected by the code. It must be recognized, clearly, that there are definite limitations upon methods of enforcement of standards, voluntarily accepted by licensees who, under the law, are solely responsible for the way in which their stations operate. When the members of the Association adopted the By-law which empowered the Board to act with respect to standards, they used the word "*observance*" rather than "*enforcement*." When the standards have been put into final form and adopted, I shall suggest to the Board that a special committee of representative broadcasters be constituted, for the purpose of reviewing all possible methods for securing "*observance*." In this respect, as in the preparation of standards, it is much more important that we proceed wisely, than that we proceed hastily. In this respect, as in the preparatory stage, we must be guided by experience and experimentation.

Our present task—and we should give it our single-minded attention—is to be sure that the Standards which we prepare and adopt are as near perfect as possible; as nearly adapted as possible to meet our needs, and the needs of the people whom we serve. We have a *greater* obligation, in doing this, than many of the professions to which I have referred, because of the fact that broadcasters control a great medium of communication, and are the protectors of one of the greatest freedoms enjoyed by the American people.

Against this background, it becomes obvious that unwillingness to adopt and observe standards would necessarily imply a lack of sufficient maturity to understand the nature of the professional spirit and lack of capacity to assume its responsibilities. I would be the last to condemn any particular broadcaster for such inadequacies. After all, many of the stimuli which prepare members of other groups for professional consciousness and activity, are absent in the case of broadcasting. So far,



the formal educational processes—such as are provided by the schools of law, medicine, engineering, journalism, nursing, accountancy—have not been developed for broadcasting. So far, the customary background of professional science has not been established in texts and treatises. We lack the prestige enjoyed by other professional groups in community, state and national life. We are surprised when we discover our own potentialities; we are not only cautious, but shy and timid in asserting our power and influence in public places and before public agencies.

Perhaps a few of us would be willing, even happy, to assume the role of carriers of freight and express—peddling packaged goods—if by doing so we could be *relieved* of professional responsibilities. Perhaps a few of us are tempted to squirm guiltily, and admit every charge which the cynics, the satirists, and the rival media gaily toss our way, rather than stand up and toss them back again. Where the lawyers, journalists, or physicians would rise in angry protest and swarm down upon an over-reaching government agency, we are inclined to acquiesce. After all, we are still—to a considerable extent—a heterogeneous aggregation of individuals, while other professional groups enjoy the confidence and stability which comes from centuries of tradition and cooperative action.

But all this makes it even more important that we come of age, professionally. By thinking and acting as professional people do, we come sooner to the maturity which must be achieved. It is not necessary to wait for centuries to pass in order to obtain such professional consciousness and capacity. It was not necessary to wait centuries for the scientific development and exploitation of the basic discoveries which made broadcasting possible. There are plenty of broadcasters who are, as individuals, professionally mature, and capable of expanding the professional side of our development, just as quickly and convincingly as was done by the physical scientists. It is time to act. We have deliberated long enough. If the draft of Standards which is submitted to you is not a fairly balanced product, let us put it quickly into shape and into operation. I have full faith and confidence that you will do so.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> The Standards of Practice were approved and adopted on May 18, 1948, effective July 1, 1948.

★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS  
1771 N STREET, N. W., WASHINGTON 6, D. C.



**Comments**

1 Any broadcasting designed to "buy" the radio au-  
2 dience, by requiring it to listen in hope of reward,  
3 rather than for the quality of its entertainment,  
4 should be abolished.  
5  
6 Comments should offer the opportunity to all con-  
7 sumers to be heard on the basis of ability and skill  
8 rather than on the basis of money.  
9  
10 Details, including rules, eligibility  
11 and termination dates of  
12 contests, should be announced or es-  
13 tablished by the public; and the  
14 contest should be as open

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
84

**Freedom on Offer**

Full details of the proposed initial free breakfast for pupils to be piloted in 1990 will be published in the autumn. The introduction of an initial free breakfast for pupils will be subject to the approval of the public. In the meantime, the Government will be considering the possibility of a full day's free school meals for pupils who are in receipt of free school meals. The Government will be consulting on this proposal in the autumn.

If a parent agrees with the school that their child should be exempted from the requirement to pay for school meals, the parent will be asked to sign a declaration of satisfaction.

There would be no obligation on any parent to accept a reduction in the amount of their child's school dinners.



Scanned from the National Association of Educational Broadcasters Records  
at the Wisconsin Historical Society as part of  
"Unlocking the Airwaves: Revitalizing an Early Public and Educational Radio Collection."



A collaboration among the Maryland Institute for Technology in the Humanities,  
University of Wisconsin-Madison Department of Communication Arts,  
and Wisconsin Historical Society.

Supported by a Humanities Collections and Reference Resources grant from  
the National Endowment for the Humanities



Any views, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this publication/collection do not necessarily reflect those of the  
National Endowment for the Humanities.